

APPLICANT(S): SHOENFELD, Yehuda et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/405,050
FILED: September 27, 1999
Page 2

Status of Claims

Claims 1-11 and 22-29 are pending in the application. Claims 1-11 and 22-29 have been rejected.

Double Patenting Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 and 22-29 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of issued U.S. Patent No. 5,965,130. In response, Applicants will consider, upon an indication by the Examiner of allowable subject matter, the filing of a terminal disclaimer for the above-identified U.S. Patent Application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner hold the rejection in abeyance until such time.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 and 22-29 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of issued U.S. Patent No. 5,562,902. In response, Applicants will consider, upon an indication by the Examiner of allowable subject matter, the filing of a terminal disclaimer for the above-identified U.S. Patent Application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner hold the rejection in abeyance until such time.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 112

Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing his rejection of claims 1-3 and 7-11 and 25-29 under 35 C.F.R §102(b), and noting that none of the cited prior art anticipates the use of IVIG for inhibiting metastasis of lymphoma.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 and 22-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as allegedly lacking support in the specification at the time of filing by containing